

Application Serial No. 10/625,287
Reply to office action of May 25, 2006

PATENT
Docket: CU-3301

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Pending in this patent application are claims 1-10 before this amendment. By the present amendment, claim 2 is cancelled without prejudice. No new matter has been added.

In the office action (page 3), FIG. 3 received on March 28, 2006 is not accepted by the examiner allegedly on grounds that the corrected FIG. 3 does not match with the detailed specification.

The applicants disagree, and respectfully submit that they are disclosed and supported by the specification

In addition, the amendments to the specification filed on November 27, 2006 are not accepted by the examiner, allegedly on grounds that the amendments introduce the new matter into the disclosure of the invention.

The applicants respectfully disagree as to the rejection over FIG. 3, the amendments to the specification made on November 27, 2006, and claim 2; however, the applicants at this time wish to expedite the present application to issuance for the allowed claims 1 and 3-10 while reserving all the rights to prosecute claim 2 as well as the subject matter of the specification and drawings that were rejected/objected to by the examiner. FIG. 3 has been stored back to the original FIG. 3; the last amendments to the specification has been cancelled; however, the applicants respectfully submit that the applicants wish to

In the office action, claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

In the office action, claims 1 and 3-10 are allowed.

In response, two paragraphs in the specification page 10, line 10, to page 11, line 23, have been amended mainly to reassign the switch numbers SW32-SW60 to SW30-SW58, respectively, as these switches have been renumbered in the last filed

Application Serial No. 10/625,287
Reply to office action of May 25, 2006

PATENT
Docket: CU-3301

amendment. No switch is connected to SR31, which shifts the signal outputted from the SR30 in response to the OES signal. At least for these reasons, the applicants respectfully request acceptance of FIG. 3 as amended in the last filed amendment.

In the office action, claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

In response, claim 2 has been amended. As described in the specification page 4, lines 8-12 [¶0011], the blurring problems are present in the conventional art. The specification page 4, lines 13-23 [¶¶0012-0013] describes that the conventional device cannot be driven at 85 Hz due to various conventional problems including blurring. The presently claimed invention provides solutions to this and other conventional problems, and claim 2 recites this one aspect of the present invention where the liquid crystal device can cause fast moving images without blurring at the refresh rate of 60 Hz. Claim 2 is supported in the specification page 13, lines 12-16, [¶0040] and page 15, line 18, to page 16, line 11 [¶¶0046-0047], according to which the blurring phenomenon is removed since black data can be sufficiently inserted within the vertical blanking interval. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the present rejection.

In the office action, claims 1 and 3-10 stand allowed.

For the reasons set forth above, the applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-10 pending in this application are in condition for allowance and respectfully request issuance of a Notice of Allowance in the next action. Should the examiner have any remaining questions or concerns, the examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to expeditiously resolve such concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 19, 2009


W. William Park, Reg. No. 55,523
Ladas & Parry LLP
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300